REMARKS

Claims 15-21 and 26-33 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Kumar in view of Fifiled. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kumar discloses high speed communication devices connected to one single (DSL) transmission line. In order to avoid interference between the several communication devices, Kumar discloses a method to switch all other communication devices into a high impedance state whenever one single communication device is transmitting data. Kumar does not teach, as stated by the Examiner that "a switchable electrical component is connected (...) such that the input impedance of the first transmission unit is kept to an approximately constant value". However, the Examiner states that Fifield discloses these limitations. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Fifield teaches a constant impedance driver for high speed interface. As disclosed in paragraphs [0002] and [0035], the apparatus according to Fifield relates to integrated circuit technology, specifically to drivers for a high speed memory interface. Therefore, as Fifield does not relate to DSL technology, there is no reason why one skilled in the art would consult Fifield when meeting the problems pointed out in the instant specification. Fifield refers to an entirely different technology field from the instant invention. Moreover, Fifield does not disclose that the electrical component is switched by the impedance means. According to the wording of our claim this impedance clearly refers to the impedance unit that is assigned to the sensor monitoring the operating state of the first transmission unit. As Fifield does not disclose such sensors (and, therefore, no impedance that is assigned to a sensor) the disclosure of Fifield fails to teach the claimed invention.

Additionally, the Examiner refers to FET circuits having a certain impedance, but not to an impedance unit that can be connected to the transmission line. According to our invention, on the other hand, the "impedance" includes both a resistor and a switch (Z_{Syn} & S). Thus, the impedance has to be understood as "impedance unit". Indeed, the direct translation from the original German priority document translates to this term more appropriately.

Claims 22-25 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Kumar in view of Fifield, further in view of deBriggard. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the same reasons presented in the arguments above.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is solicited. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing, referencing Attorney Docket No. 119010-108.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY: _____

Kevin R. Spivak
Reg. No. 43,148
Customer No. 29177

Dated: February 17, 2009